Vol. XXXI, 1 Whole No. 121

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

EDITED BY

BASIL L. GILDERSLEEVE
Francis White Professor of Greek in the Johns Hopkins University

BALTIMORE: THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS
London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co.
Paris: Albert Fontemoing Leipsic: F. A. Brockhaus

January, February, March
1910

CONTENTS.

I.—Serviana. By E. G. SIHLER, ... 1

II.—Latin Inscriptions at the Johns Hopkins University. IV. By HARRY LANGFORD WILSON, ... 25

III.—The Number of the Dramatic Company in the Period of the Technitae. By KELLEY REES, ... 43

IV.—Linguistic Notes on the Shāhbāzgarhi and Mansehra Redactions of Asoka's Fourteen-Edicts. Third Part. By TRUMAN MICHELSON, ... 55

V.—Cicero De Officiis 2. 10. By CHARLES KNAPP, ... 66

VI.—"A Syntactician among the Psychologists". By BASIL L. GILDERSLEEVE, ... 74

VII.—An Avestan Parallel in Darius Nakš-i-Rustam, b. By H. C. TOLMAN, ... 80

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES: 81

Friedrich's Catulli Veronensis Liber (Sammlung Wissenschaftlicher Kommentare zu griechischen und römischen Schriftstellern).—Deicke's De Scholiis in Apollonium Rhodium Quaestiones Selectae.—Eitrem's Hermes und die Toten.

REPORTS: 96

Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik.—Philologus.

BRIEF MENTION, ... 108

RECENT PUBLICATIONS, ... 118

BOOKS RECEIVED, ... 121

Open to original communications in all departments of philology, classical, comparative, oriental, modern; condensed reports of current philological work; summaries of chief articles in the leading philological journals of Europe; reviews by specialists, bibliographical lists. Four numbers constitute a volume, one volume each year. Subscription price $3.00 a year (foreign postage 50 cents), payable to the publisher in advance; **single numbers, $1.00 each. Suitable advertisements will be inserted at the following rates:**

	1 TIME.	2 T.	3 T.	4 T.
One page	$16 00	$30 00	$40 00	$50 00
Half page	8 00	15 00	20 00	25 00
Quarter page	4 00	8 00	12 00	15 00
Eighth page	2 00	4 00	6 00	8 00

The English Agents of the American Journal of Philology are Messrs. Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., Paternoster House, Charing Cross Road, London, W. C.

SPECIAL NOTICE.—The stock of complete sets of THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY has passed over into the hands of the undersigned. **These sets will be sold for the present at the reduced price of $60 for the thirty volumes, cash to accompany the order.** Single volumes, $3 (foreign postage, 50 cents); single numbers, $1 each, so far as they can be supplied. Address,

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS, Baltimore, Md.

Published quarterly. Three dollars a year (foreign postage, 50 cents).

The Lord Baltimore Press

BALTIMORE, MD., U. S. A.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

Catulli Veronensis Liber, erklärt VON GUSTAV FRIEDRICH (Sammlung Wissenschaftlicher Kommentare zu griechischen und römischen Schriftstellern). Teubner, 1908.

This volume contains 61 pages of text, followed by 499 pages of notes, with an actual verbiage far in excess of Ellis's extended commentary. It is the work of a Catullus enthusiast who has explored the Catullus country about the Lago di Garda and its effluents, and observed the Mediterranean Islands, their tides, beaches and *algae*. It is a work of many sided learning and inquiry; fertile in palaeographical lore and expedient; resourceful in literary parallel; adroit in textual interpretation and exegesis and the psychological data thereto contributory; observant of life and society (till it conveys the sense of swagger); interested (however inexpert) in the interpretation of linguistic phenomena; affluent in suggestiveness; venturesome; flippant toward Robinson Ellis (p. 389; cf. p. 232), flouting of Hale (Vorwort), actually fleering at Vahlen (p. 424);[1] not uncritical toward Caesar (pp. 231, 515); tolerant of Cicero (pp. 184, 231); always and everywhere abject toward Catullus; but interesting, provocative and, to speak from a sense of personal gratitude, instructive. And because I have been interested and instructed, I hope I may be pardoned for passing in summary review over many of the points made by Friedrich.[2]

I. On phonetic and linguistic questions: Not without good general points of view, as to the inconsistency of epigraphic orthography (220)—which is no proof that Catullus was incon-

[1] Di magni, salaputtium insolentem ! (quo' Dr. Magnus).

[2] Formal blemishes: (1) needless repetitions; e. g., Sil. Ital. 14, 361—quoted twice on same page (325); p. 366 repeats, almost without change, some 10 lines from p. 334; p. 346 repeats from elsewhere some excellent remarks about not cutting out the unusual from a writer; constantly rings the changes on 'traductio'—repetition of a word with slight difference in shade of meaning: (2) long demonstrations of the obvious, a) in palaeography, the same phenomenon being often taken up half-a-dozen times; e. g., p. 249, 15 lines of examples of the confusion cl/d; p. 256, several lines for b/v; pp. 181, 286 (et saepe) 8 and 11 lines for confusion of ii/u, nu/mi, etc.—but in spite of all these repetitions the note on 71. 1 fails to explain the limitation of the shift of L/T promised on p. 343; p. 164, having convincingly corrected parum to pari in, squanders a full page to do the work of two lines; p. 211, examples of confusion est/et; b) in syntax, etc., p. 476, long list of examples of incorporated antecedent; p. 460, cf. ad = chez; p. 115, 6 examples for nullus = non (L. and Sh. give 11, or Stowasser 3); p. 311, illustrates at length hinc = a me, etc.; p. 237 defends at length change of MS subito to subido in Aulus Gellius 19, 9, 11, though the Teubner edition prints subido; 3) changes numbering of lines in c. 61 and cites Neue in the penultimate edition (p. 367).

sistent in his spelling—and the perfect normality of coining a new word by suffixation (419; ad 66, 58); p. 193 (36, 13) shows that initial *gn-* did not make position, a fact that has no bearing on syllable (or vowel) length before *-gn-*, nor does inscriptional gnatus prove that *g-* was sounded; pp. 125, 98 fn., Fr.'s alleged examples of "Vorgewalt des *a*" are susceptible of explanation by ductus confusion of *a* and *e* (cf. Munro, Criticisms and Elucidations, index references), and Catullus may have written Sărā́pim as Lucretius wrote rutúndus, lucúna. As a script phenomenon, "Vorgewalt des *a*" can hardly differ from any other case of anticipation. Personally, I am more interested in the "Vorklang des *r*" (525) because of *accersit/arcessit* (v. Proc. Am. Phil. Assoc. 37, 5; 24); cf. *credrae* (Petron. 38, 1) = *citri*.[1]

One can but wonder to what public Friedrich addresses the explanation of rhotacism (427), or the statement that *-um* (gen. plu., 2d decl.) is not a contraction of *-orum* (403), and for whom he explains potis/pote (215) and the <p> of hiemps (p. 464).

What makes a correct statement of matters of historical phonetics so difficult for the general philologian? Save for a few subtle points involving temporal adjustments, the lautgesetze are, as a writer in the Nation pointed out not so long ago, susceptible to formulations as mechanical, and almost as irrefutable as the multiplication table; but here comes a philologian of unmistakable learning and talents, who asserts that Latin *qu-* is a development from a *p-* (104), while later (154) he seems to think that the *quo-* of quoquo 'I cook' is lautgesetzlich for *pe*; p. 306, loss of *r* in ru(r)sus ascribed to avoidance of successive *r*'s, in spite of deosum, quosum, susum and dossum; and in spite of templum, exemplum, extemplo he speaks (537) of the inconvenience to Roman lips of *-mpl-* in Pimplea, alleging in proof Alc<u>mena, drach<u>ma, m<i>na, tech<i>na. In rosido (264; 61, 24)[2] he would see, without more ado, a genuine prerhotacistic form for rorido—which, in the light of Pliny's roscido . . humore (N. H. 9, 38), and the uncertainty as between *sci/si* in any later MS, must forever remain an open question.

II. Text-criticism: There is an interesting freshness in the treatment of textual questions. Thus at 10, 32 O has *tulsa* for *tu insulsa*, and not content with designating it as a skip Fr. furnishes us with modern instances[3] like a schoolboy's[4] fürdig =

[1] By the assumption of "Vorausnahme des *r*" (cf. Schulze, Latein. Eigenn. 209) we justify the quite inescapable equation of Κέρβερος with Skr. *Çabdlas*.

[2] On p. 75 Fr. actually decides that c. 61 is earlier than c. 68 because of the preponderance of *-ier* infinitives in 61.

[3] Friedrich rightly disregards the import, if I mistake it not myself, of the sentiment of John Selden (Table Talk 9, 9): To quote a modern Dutchman where I may use a classic author, is as if I were to justify my reputation, and I (sic) neglect all persons of note and quality that know me, and bring the testimonial of the scullion in the kitchen.

[4] For the confusion of *p/c* in Catullus MSS Munro (on Aetna 182, and p. 29) seems to me a better point of departure than a schoolboy's pôte for côte in

für würdig, and his own alto = at multo, nostis = nos estis (127);[1] and he notes (446) how even the German author of a doctor's dissertation has quoted as Albert one who should be listed in the bibliography as A. Ebert; p. 338, apropos of Adriana for Ariadna (64, 54), Fr. glimpses a monk, and gives an instructive list of errors due to monkish associations of ideas. And he exhibits a positive genius for finding parallels for his assumptions, thus on p. 206 (40, 1), after reading Raui[de] ('the scribe meant rabide') he cites Athen. 15, 689^{a} for Μάγα, MSS μεγάλη; and after correcting parcus/partus to pastus (39, 11) he cites Sil. Ital 9, 603 for the same correction.[2]

But the general attitude of the author towards text-criticism, however he may fall short of his ideals, is sound. He notes on p. 263, for example, that two grammatical or metrical peculiarities are mutually supporting; and he is perfectly sane in his judgment of conscribillent (26, 4): die Frage ob C. habe conscribellent screiben (sic) können, ist völlig müssig; er *hat* es geschrieben; and he exhibits a similar sanity (91) as regards ipsa = domina. Contrariwise, to save the insensitive Roman ear, he rejects one of 7 consecutive est's in 60, 60–64; and in 47, 2 corrects mundi to saecli, on the perfectly futile plea that the sense 'people' does not appear for mundus till—Horace (Sat. 1, 3, 112); though Catullus in his 7 uses of saec(u)lum exhibits only the sense of generation, while here he wants to say 'in all the world' (= mundi) and not merely 'of the time' <saecli>.

And now to proceed with more detail. Fr. has a marked talent for seeing glosses in the corruptions of the text. Now the glosses in Catullus MSS are either ductus *ossias*,[3] or else glosses of grammatical interpretation, proceeding from scribes or owners (users) of MSS, who would insert an o, say, above a vocative, or a quia at the beginning of a phrase logically, but not formally, causal (cf. O's reading of 68, 93). Avoiding rather the usual classification of involuntary errors, Fr. employs such sub-classifications as Vorgewalt des *a* (125), Vorklang des *r* (525), and 'false genitives' (256, 273, etc.). Another rich lead for textual correction is the mistake of contractions. In his use of

---

a French theme (331); cf. Eurotae, but MSS Europe (435); P/C also in Lucr. 1, 271; 4, 570; 4, 590; cf. Aen., 4, 26 (F).

[1] Note the curious long-distance skipping Friedrich himself makes—thanks to the way we scholars put our notes on slips—p. 369, ad vs. 259: alliteration findet sich ebenso v. 259, pars obscura cauis *celebrabant* orgia *cistis*, sprich *kelebranda kistis*)(ad v. 287, Meliasin linquens claris *celebranda* choreis (sprich *kelebranda*).

[2] I use the word correction advisedly, for the pastus of C., reported by Modius, would probably turn out a ductus misreading for partus; and the emendation raptus seems to me probably right (on P/R cf. Fr., 148, 206, 250—even in inscriptions).

[3] This Italian musical term is a great convenience for describing such a text reading as *parcus* al. *partus*, when the scribe, unable to decide whether his original had *c* or *t*, reported both possibilities; such a gloss would commonly be superposed.

these classes, Fr. often chooses the wrong rubric, being especially addicted to explanation from a gloss or a sign of contraction. Let us take, e. g., 63, 5, where the right reading, as adopted by Friedrich, is certainly, we will admit, Deuol*s*it ile*i*[as] acuto sibi ponder*a* silice[s]: Fr. develops all this from the one assumption of deuol$\overset{s}{\text{u}}$it, whence the *s* first jumped to the end of the line, then *ilei*, misread il*e*t, having picked up an *a* from acuto, was made to agree with silices; whereas silice<s> is just as apt to have picked up an *s* from iletas, though in very truth I find it hard to believe that such a supra-script *s* floated loosely over the line till it conveniently settled—anywhere. If we must look upon the -*s* of silices- as the fons viti, it were just as easy to suppose that silicei (cf. pumice<i>, Persa 41, and Lindsay, Lat. Lang., p. 391)[1] in vs. 5, may have got its -*s* from anim<e>is above it in v. 4; or a copyist, puzzled by the spelling silice*i*, may have written silices 'to make it Latin'.[2] So, with his predilection for the long-distance gloss explanation marmorea pelago (63, 88) is derived from marmora pelag$\overset{e}{\text{o}}$ rather than from marmor$\overset{e}{\text{a}}$ pelago.[3] Nor can I think that any scribe, finding campi at the end of 64, 344, so glossed it as to make the line read cum Phrygii Teucro manabunt sanguine Teucri, whence the riddlesome teuen with which the line actually ends. No, teuen means that V had teneri, and this probably means that in a capital archetype CAMPI was read CANERI; then in an uncial stage of transmission caneri was capable of being read teneri—all supposing that campi is what Catullus wrote.—50, 19, (183) MSS ocello for ocelle attributed to o$\overset{o}{\text{c}}$elle, with vocative sign, instead of to o/e.[4]—34, 11 (209) saltumque rec*u*nditorum explained from salt$\overset{u}{\text{u}}$mque reconditorum, but I should rather find an explanation to accord with cunuenit cunf<eratur> cummunibus umnium in a copy of the edict of Diocletian, anno[5] 301.—61, 186 (277). Why is uiris glossed by unis, when the ductus confusion ri/n is so common, and uins would of course be read unis?—62, 64 (295). Why assume the explanatory gloss tu over pugnare to account for tuignare[6] when P/T (in thin capitals) is so admissible a confusion (cf. Lucretius 1, 16; 2, 43)?

[1] Archaic, that is to say sacral intention (cf. p. 478), may have furnished the motive for this spelling, cf. virtutei on a Scipio epitaph of 130 B. C.

[2] Friedrich might also have operated with ile$\overset{a}{\text{i}}$ (*a* being not uncommonly confused with *ei* in Catullus' MSS (v. p. 370) as the source of ileta<s>.

[3] The confusion of o/e is very common in Catullus MSS (v. p. 62), but a/e is not unknown (v. p. 458).

[4] I suspect that in cave despuas ocelle the vocative was construed by some scribe as a dative.

[5] I cite from Wessely's Schrifttafeln, p. 8; cf. also the Thesaurus, s. v. cum, 1341, 3–8.

[6] Cf. Munro, l. c. 163. Note the confusion P/E, Lucr. 2, 938; P/L, ib., 6, 103; P/I, ib., 1, 846.

III. Particular emendations: 41, 1 (208), A me an. a. (puella) emended to Aminaea 'des Weinland's <Tochter'>. But our lack of knowledge of a locality named Ameae does not prove its non-existence. Why not correct to Anne<i>ana, imagining Catullus to be indulging in his habit ut suos quoque attingat, and locating the puella at Anneianum (Castellum)[1] in Gallia Transpadana, not far from Verona, and within the wintering circuit of Caesar and Mamurra? What so likely as for Catullus to use provincia, *tout court*, of the province[2] in which he lived?—41, 8 (211). Fr. reads est imaginosa, and I believe his interpretation to be correct, but imaginosum is perhaps susceptible to defence; cf. Vergil's varium et mutabile semper femina and Cicero's roges me quid aut quale sit deus (N. D., 1, 60); <vis memoriae> si quid sit hoc non vides, at quale sit vides (Tusc. Disp. 1, 60)—54, 1 (241). Heri derived from et eri, but why not ET = H, and no pother about er$\overset{ei}{e}$?; sed/si (in the 4th line) is a commonplace.—62, 35 (289). Accepts Schrader's eous for eosdem; correction unnecessary,[3] the situation being quite clear when we reflect that fures (34) = adulteri (cf. furta = adulteria, common in the sermo amatorius).—64, 75 (343), tecta preferred to templa on grounds palaeographically insufficient, as the MSS read tempta or templa (D), the change L/T being easy enough for a capital MS. Here templa might be defended, as the victims were coming there as to a place of sacrifice (? cf. 132, patriis ab aris). <But Fr. may have given the right verdict on the reading, for in Lucretius 2, 28 Macrobius reads tecta where OQ have templa>.—64, 205 (363), defense of quo m<o>tu[nc] very strong.—64, 287 (376), claris (Itali) for Doris ably defended. Against <Hae>monisin Fr. argues (373): In den Codd. anderer Schriftsteller ist die erste Silbe eines Wortes oft weggelassen worden, in den Handschriften des C. kommt das aber nicht <anders> vor: to which there is no answer, because it is no argument; but the defense of Meliasin is strong, and this reading is resolvable by ductus out of Minosim better than any other proposed—except Aemonisin!—66, 59 (420), for the extraction of hic liquidi uario out of hi dii uen ibi (uen' = uenus being excised as a gloss; cf. 64, 8 where diva is glossed by uen) nothing but admiration can be felt.—71, 1 (p. 472, and passim) sacer alarum of the Itali is certainly right and, neglecting all the subtleties of Fr., sacratorum etc. are all simply enough accounted for by supposing saceratarum (L/T)

[1] First recorded in the Itinerarium Antonini.

[2] Caesar (B. G. 1, 10, 5) uses citerior provincia; and has extra provinciam. The psychological phenomenon is attested by the names Provence and Cologne: cf. in c. 17, 1, Catullus's own use of Colonia without specification.

[3] For my own part, I can but insist on a canon of criticism something as follows: In spite of all the vicissitudes to which MSS have been subject in transmission, an intelligible and metrical text has the nine points of the law, possession, in its favor: why for 64, 125 (364) give good reasons for reading longe, and then better ones for the longa of the MSS?

as the sole fons viti.—78b : pace Fr., who admits that change of person does not invalidate the contention, 78b is an integral part of 78. In 78b I see an *envoi* to Gallus who, having first been proclaimed pander between his nephew and sister-in-law, is then directly upbraided as the dirty lover of a decent girl. Nor do I look for Lesbia in every (pura) puella Catullus mentions. The use of the envoi is characteristic of Catullus : he closes c. 51 with an envoi addressed to himself—not an artistic blemish of the same heinousness as the awful madame, ich liebe dich stanza with which Heine brought Du bist wie eine Blume to a close—and, after crying out, in c. 14, on a number of the bad poets of his day, he ends with an envoi to his readers: si qui forte mearum ineptiarum lectores eritis, manusque uestras non horrebitis admovere nobis, <non horrebitis admonere me id uos>.[1]—83, 6 (507): coquitur for loquitur is not to be approved; in uritur et loquitur uritur means ardet amore, but no less ardet ira,[2] and et means 'und zwar' (cf. p. 145), or better 'and so' (cf. L. and Sh., s. v., II F.), while loquitur is the simplex repeating the obloquitur of v. 4 (cf. Am. Jr. Phil., 24, 262).—114, 1 (548). Instead of Firmano saltu I should advocate Firmani[s] saltus.

IV. Stylistic and Literary. Not without the power himself to hit off a ringing phrase, Friedrich is aware that poetic license in diction is poetic choice within as wide a range of dialect as the poet commands (308, 328, 337), subject only to the restrictions of his own taste and judgment.[3] He knows that the vulgar is often only archaic (160), and that the archaic may give the religious note (478), and he rightly estimates the worth of redundancy.[4] Sensitive to diction, he often notes verbal repetition, with change in the shade of meaning (401 ; cf. traductio, p. 553).[5] Lucretius, Catullus[6] and Prudentius constitute his immortal trio of poets that wrote in Latin (396), and de Musset is his modern immortal (393). He counters Antimachus (522) with Nataly von Eschstruth—not knowing our own Laura Jean Libby. Interested in

[1] This imaginary line is only an ad sensum restoration ; non horrebitis may be defended as Friedrich's "differently nuanced repetition" (pp. 177, 202, passim) and would mean 'you wont be shocked'.

[2] In c. 2 ardore means ira, as I shall attempt later on to demonstrate.

[3] As English poets use ta'en and p'raps for metrical purposes, however out of their own dialect these forms may be.

[4] P. 207. Wenn Schmidt in den Dichtungen, auch Prosawerken aller Zeiten und Völker, alles Tautologische beseitigen will, so schneidet er ein Drittel ihres gegenwärtigen Umfanges weg und die Hälfte aller Anmut mit.

[5] Missing the repetition of saecla . . anus 68, 43–45)(77, 9.

[6] The parallels cited for Catullus and Lucretius (395) leave me cold : mens animi (65, 3 ; Lucr. 5, 149) was already Plautine ; and ipsa in morte (76, 18), a self-evident and self-sustaining conjecture of the 'Itali', can hardly have influenced or reflected leti iam limine in ipso (Lucr. 6, 115, 7). And why, recalling the manner of Caesar's death, appeal to Lucretius, in the effort to explain why Polyxena (64, 370; 395) gathered her dress about her to die decently: as though stage Polyxenas had not followed the canons of comely death von je her.

literary tradition, he gathers apostrophes to the separating doors from as far away as Babylon (436), omitting, however, to mention the wall of Pyramus[1] and Thisbe in The Midsummer Night's Dream. He is interested also in questions of fact and life, the alga on the beach (338), the eternal charm of Sirmio (180); and he attributes to Catullus a sound, healthy interest in geography (119), not similarly exhibited by de Musset <a child of the times of the Murrays and Joannes>. The scurrae elegantes of modern capitals (197), the gossip of idle diplomats (153), the Czarina's fondness for perfumes come in for notice, and the Cybele frenzy is matched with the Salvation Army.[2] We may note for special admiration the following statement of the influence of soul on scenery[3] (182): nicht der Benacus lacht, und nicht das Haus kichert aus allen Ecken sondern Catullus lacht, und darum scheint ihm alles rings zu lachen.

V. Interpretation: Friedrich's interpretations of cc. 67 and 68 are particularly interesting and attractive, and deserve careful attention. He seems to me to have given to 112 a final interpretation, by the correct definition of multus (= quasi 'gadabout'); and to have worked wonders with 54. I note the following special points, reserving for another occasion the attempt to solve certain difficulties not solved, I think, by Friedrich:—7, 9, tam te basia multa basiare: te is subject.—8, 12, uale puella; omission of adj. with puella (here only) interpreted as proof of growing obduratio.—14, 7, novom ac repertum 'strange and recherché': these adjectives do not prove to me that libelli had not before then been used for saturnalia presents, only that Calvus had not worked off so teasing a present on Catullus before.—61, 76, excellent ad sensum restoration of two stanzas, but Friedrich adds with some aplomb: man wird in diesen Gedanken und Satzfolge die Bewegung des catullischen Geistes nicht verkennen. The 3 lines inserted after vs. 107 are also cleverly imagined.

VI. Definition: On p. 226 a good paragraph on "okkasionelle Bedeutung" (by which is meant a definite contextual restriction —though it sometimes wears the look of an expansion—of the general meaning of a word; e. g., cupidus for cupidus pecuniae = avidus), but such restrictions are not due to the poverty of the Latin language. English is not a tongue of restricted vocabulary, but herdess, in the restricted sense of shepherdess, might be quoted from our great authors; and surely Juvenal in 2, 79–80 restricts grex to sheep and scabies to sheep-rot, without a guiding context.

[1] My galley proof had it Tyrannis, ductus confusions that might interest Friedrich.

[2] A revival of gulf-state blacks not being available, I suppose, for comparison: not that the shouting form of "getting religion" was confined in our population to the blacks.

[3] The influence of scenery on soul is of course done to death by the sentimentally literary.

Special words, aethera *album*[1] (305; 63, 40): the comparison of Fr. *aube* 'dawn' is instructive, but why is not Ach. Statius ad loc. cited, who quoted Ennius, Ann. 212 (Vahlen[3], q. v.): ut primum tenebris abiectis in<d>albabat cf. Apul. Met. 7, 1 . . inalbebat), to which add Aen. 4, 586: . . ut primum albescere lucem/uidit.—*atque adeo* (329; Ovid, Tri. 3, 1, 77) is better defined for English folk by Tyrrell (cf. his Cicero in his letters, p. 140, ad Att. 1, 17, 20);—*dies* (476; 68, 147-8), as marked on a calendar, is not night, neither is soles> dies> noctes (113, 8, 3) in the least probable: as though habitual assignations in the house of an Allius were always more conveniently arranged for the night (cf. c. 32, and Cicero, pro Cael. §§ 35, 37).—*electissima* (191; 36, 6) = most recherché, choicest in point of badness, I think; *hic* (224; 45, 14) is tender—because it applies to 'the party of the 2d part' considered as belonging to 'the party of the 1st'.—*involasti* (156; 25, 6) = 'hast stolen' (for which see L. and Sh., to which Friedrich adds nothing).—*iocosa* (114, ad 8, 6) ist unser 'Unsinn machen' in sexuellem Sinne; cf. in an exalted sense, T. E. Brown's: We love, God makes; in our sweet *mirth* |God spies occasion for a birth.—*Ipsicilla* (184; 32, 1), which, as I agree with Fr. in thinking, is the undoubted reading, is not a diminutive, but a significant compound, modeled on the Greek compounds in αὐτο-, and a-rhyme with Plautine strittivilla;—cilla is cognate with cillit 'crisat', cillo 'cinaedus', and Ipsicilla was a Medullina[2] (Juv. 6, 322) or a Telethusa (Priap. 19).[3] For this interpretation of Ipsicilla, I find some warrant in Moecilla (113, 2), where the form used as a nickname for Mucia (archaic Moecia) probably meant to suggest Moechi-cilla.—*iterabimus*[4] (Hor. C. 1, 7, 32, p. 325) can hardly mean 'plough<the sea>', unless we are to suppose that sulcare, *tout seul*, might mean 'to sail'.—*meditata* (285; 62, 12): who ever thought meditata could be used of an improvisation?—*miserae* (355; 64, 140), not misere, with Fr., means 'verliebt' (cf. 495).—*nec* (176; 30, 4) = 'sacral'

[1] This use of album reveals the import of Ennius, Ann. 89—:

89 interea sol albus recessit in infera noctis;
exin candida se radiis dedit ista foras lux,
et simul ex alto longe pulcherrima praepes
laeua uolauit auis; simul aureus exoritur sol,

Here in infera noctis means ad imam noctem, and sol albus suggests prima lux, l'aube, cf. Ann. 102,

cum superum lumen nox intempesta teneret,

where, if superum lumen be the zenith, the furthest point below the zenith would properly be called inferum. After the alba comes aurora (90), and then sunrise (92).

[2] Of obvious derivation from medulla: one wonders whether Messalina was meant, in spite of the lack of rhythmical balance.

[3] Priap. 19 and Martial 14, 203 seem to stand in some relation of source and sequent.

[4] I have always thought of it as a verb of motion (cf. iter), like superare.

non.—*noti* (503; 79, 4) active sense, yes; but because, like hospites, ξένοι, it is a reciprocal word.—*nutrices* (328; 64, 18) = mammae; here cf. sine uiro (63, 6) = sine testiculis, for in both cases a class name is used for what is the essential characteristic of the class.—*perspicere* (530; 100, 6) seems to me to mean much more than cognoscere, as much, all question of <igni> aside, as our 'test' (cf. Tyrrell, op. cit., p. 263, ad Fam. 9, 16, 1; adding de Amic. § 29 studio perspecto, Fam. 13, 60, 1 fidem perspicere).—*paene insula* (180; 31, 1): und sonst ist paene insula "beinahe eine Insel" meist treffender als unser Halbinsel:[1] the American advertisers, with their 'nearsilk', and the topers, with their 'nearbeer', may be paving the way for 'nearisland' in English.—*praetrepidans* (225; 46, 7; cf. praegestit, 64, 145), *prae* not = per, but graphically depicts the leaning forward of trembling eagerness.—*quies* (104; 4, 25): granted the sense of 'resting-place', Lucr. 1, 104 is an undoubted parallel. *re-* (159; 25, 9): interesting list of examples of *re-* with negative force, but *re-* with verbs of fastening, closing (cf. my Most., ad 452) should not be confounded with *re-* in reponere (cf. 181; 31, 8), which means 'to put down, by, up', no more definitely than does the simplex, ponere.[2]—*requirere* (252; 55, 18) means 'to <go> back in search of'.—*sensit* (329; 64, 21), defined, after sententia, as quasi 'voted': why not, as usual, by 'realized'? [In Cic. Leg. 3, 39 quid sentiant = the real belief]—*strictura* (414; 66, 50) kann nicht mit stringere zusammenhängen; denn strictura ist feruens ferrum: nay, stringit is English strikes, and strictura is quantum ferri faber una opera e fornace ad stringendum extollit; its incandescence, however essential and characteristic, was incidental only.—*tenuit* (330; 64, 28), defined by 'fesselte' is suggestive of Browning's fondness for the word 'fixed', *tout court*, for 'fixed the attention of'.—*tremulus* (145; 17, 12) means, I think, 'a-tremble'—lest he wake his child; or the arm was literally 'shaky' from long holding.—*voster* ist (203; 39, 20) = tuus (Schwabe). Allerdings geraten sonst ganz harmlose gutmütige Männer in einen heiligen Zorn, wenn sie von dieser Gleichsetzung hören, und lieber verzichten sie auf den naheliegenden, einzig möglichen Sinn, statt eine grammatische Marotte aufzugeben (quotes 55, 22 for uostri = tui—unless this be a distributing dual).

VII. Grammatical.—254, correct warning that Roman <and subsequent> grammarians have drawn their rules too sweepingly or the facts.—224 (45, 17), sinistrant chimerically defended as a vulgar form a <mediaeval> copyist was trying to save (better restore sinistra uti).—391 (64, 379), mitto = desisto defended by

[1] The shortcomings of the German half-translations of Greek and Latin words are startlingly in evidence in "Fernrohr", which I count as electissimum among ill-made words.

[2] From reddit 'puts back' the sense of 'puts in the proper place' took its rise, I take it.

two examples not more cogent than half-a-dozen in L. and Sh.—201 (39, 9). Well-known fact that pronouns come early in their phrases, and are ' bunched ', stated as if it were an esoteric truth.—390 (64, 362), mors for mortuus.—161 (27, 4). In illustration of what I call ' rich ' comparison the very instructive example, Mi. 664, leniorem dices quam mutumst mare, might have been mentioned—428 (66, 91), examples of non with the impv.—391 (64, 378), nec mater maesta . . mittet: only in Hor. C. 2, 5, 1, nondum subacta . , ualet, does English idiom require, however it may admit, our taking the negative separately with both verb and subject participle.—268 (61, 71), at queat: alleged parallels for attraction of mood may be questioned; the subjunctives belong chiefly to ideal apodoses; but at queat here does echo non queat which is apodotic to quae (= siqua) careat.—118 (9, 5), pluralis ' iterativus '; 117 (9, 5) nuntii beati is nom. plur., not gen. exclam.—404 (66, 9), multis deorum:—"jedenfalls kennt diesen Genetiv <der Zugehörigkeit> erst die nächste Generation"—which sounds suspiciously like dating a mental process.—131 (12, 8): disertus c. gen. admits of a simpler explanation.—414 (66, 51), comae mea fata: the logical, not formal, agreement of a gen. poss. with the poss. pron. (if that interpretation is correct) might have been explained more briefly.—328 (64, 18): tenus c. gen. not, as Wölfflin thought, a metrical substitute for the ablv.[1]—382 (64, 313): in pollice approximates pollice; yes, as either naue or in nave vehi, manu or in manu tenere approximate the one the other; the comparison of in amore (Prop. 1, 3, 44) is beside the mark; in amore rather approximates a dative of possession.—282 (62, 1), Olympo 'am Himmel': —besser wäre ' vom Himmel '.

Envoi: A long review? Yes, but a long book, and I have curtailed the review of my own motion, as, indeed, the book was curtailed, on good advice (Vorwort). Why all this material was packed into a commentary on Catullus we may wonder; but let us be grateful that the large book contains both interest and instruction. The book is not inerrant, but I may be permitted to record a remark of the late Professor Mau who, when I commented in a rather banal way on the inerrancy of a great German scholar, replied something to the effect that he did not care for the scholars that made no mistakes; and to conclude with the wish: non horrebitis admonere me haec vos.

EDWIN W. FAY.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS.

[1] This construction was adequately explained in my review of Lane's Latin Grammar (Cl. Rev. 14, 319) as due to the criss-cross of tenus and fini.